UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/701,069	11/27/2000	Ari Becks	BP100710	7165

			EXAMINER
466	7590	07/03/2006	PIERRE, MYRIAM

YOUNG & THOMPSON
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET
2ND FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2626	

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/701,069	BECKS ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Myriam Pierre	2626

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _3/23/06_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-6 and 8-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-2, 4-6, 8-16_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _27 November 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

    1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

    2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

    3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark

(6,345,243).

As to claims 1 and 10, Clark teaches a method for machine translation of information

given a character string in a first language into a character string in a second language,

comprising the steps of:

storage (parser stores target and source segment, col. 17 lines 32-38 Fig. 3 element 320

and Fig. 5 element 510) in a knowledge database (translation memory system, Fig. 3 element

100; col. 7 lines 58-60), a first language character string (source segment, col. 8 lines 60-61)

model segments (source project, Fig. 3 element 300, col. 8 lines 49-52) and storing second

language (target language) model segments (Fig. 3 element 310, legacy files in project identifier,

col. 8 lines 21-35) in logical connection (leverager, Fig. 3 element 340) with these, model

segments (legacy files in project identifier) in the form of character strings in the second

language (col. 13 lines 9-19; leverager determines translatable source segment in source-target

pair of a merged source-target data structure of the project matches a translatable source segment

in the corresponding merged source-target data structure generated with respect to the legacy

files),

identifying a structural segment (attribute identifier, col. 12 lines 56-61) in the character

string of said first language (source segment) following a first rule (col. 8 lines 23-25 part (a)

translatable source segments translated in corresponding target via legacy files which is a source

file that corresponds to a target file, in which the source segment/character strings are used to

identify the structural segment or legacy files);

comparing identified structural segment (attribute identifier, col. 12 lines 56-61) with

model segments (legacy files in project identifier) in the form of character strings in the first

(source) language stored (col. 12 lines 50-56; files in a project and associated legacy files are to

identify source segments) according to a second rule (col. 8 lines 25-30 part (b); translatable

source segments are morphologically (refers to structure and formation of words) equivalent to

translatable source segments source file of the project or legacy file)),

striving to select one model segment (legacy files in project identifier) on the basis of

said comparison (col. 13 lines 30-36; project identifier selects legacy files or model segments

associated with files of projects, pre-processing is carried out by the leverager, the leverager

matches or compares translatable source segments in corresponding merged source-target data

structure generated with respect to the legacy files),

reading a model (file) in the form of a character string in the second (target) language

logically connected (leverager, Fig. 3 element 340) to the selected model segment (legacy files

in project identifier) (col. 13 lines 1-9; through the leverager, generating target segments for

translatable source segments having translatable source segments in the legacy file), and

translating structural segment into translation segment in the form of a

character string in the second (target) language on the basis of said equivalent segment and a

third rule (col. 13 lines 10-15; matches of translatable source segment in corresponding merged

source-target data structure generated with respect to the legacy files), characterized in that

the identification of an intermediate word and said first rule is essentially based on the

identification of intermediate word (col. 8 lines 45-46 and 59-65)

following a first rule, identifying a first structural segment in a first language character

string (col. 8 lines 45-46 and 59-65);

when no model segment to be selected following the second rule is found as a result of

the comparison of the structural segments (col. 31 lines 30-33; ambiguous translations),

i).   the structural segment is displayed by means of a user interface to a user (col. 31

lines 42-45);

ii).   after the structural segment being displayed to the user, the user inputs, from the

user interface, the translation of the displayed structural segment as the equivalent segment (col.

31 lines 44-49);

iii).   storing the structural segment and the equivalent segment, input by the user, in the

knowledge base for use as model segments in the knowledge base (col. 32 lines 61-67; changes

approved by the user-translator are considered replacements);

one of said rules is updated on the basis of equivalent segment input by the user from the

user interface (col. 32 lines 61-67; edit or replace the selected translation, since translation is

done, the rule for translation has been updated).

As to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Clark teaches

information to be given as a character string in the second language is generated basis

of translation segments and a fourth rule (col. 7 lines 65-67 and col. 16 lines 4-7).

As to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Clark teaches

type identifier of the model segment is stored in logical connection with the model

segment (col. 26 lines 32-39).

As to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Clark teaches,

there are two model segments representing different languages logically connected to

each other (col. 32 lines 1-5).

Claim 8 recites the same or similar limitations as claim 7, rejected above, and so claim 8

is rejected for the same reason above.

As to claim 9, which depends on claim 1, Clark teaches,

characterized in that the method further comprises steps of:

reading the first information given as a character string in the first language (col. 8 lines

59-64; and col. 12 lines 49-60; the parser-extractor identifies the source segments or first

language characters);

translating the fist information given as a character string in said first language on the

basis of data in the knowledge base into first information given as a character string in the

second language to the extend allowed by the data available in the knowledge base (col. 8 lines

3-11; corresponding target segment);

determining the additional data (unique identifier) needed to complete the translation of

the first information given as a character string in the first language into first information in the

form of the character string in the second language (col. 12 lines 50-60; the parser-extractor

determines identifying attributes of each translatable source segment and target segment and

assigns a unique attribute identifier to each such segment);

feeding said additional data in the knowledge base to update the knowledge base

(col. 31 lines 51-55);

completing the translation of the first information given as a character string in the first

language into first information given as a character string in the second language (col. 31 lines

64-67 and col. 32 lines 48-51; completing is performed via the propagator),

storing said first information given in the second language (col. 33 lines 4-13);

reading the second information given as a character string in the first language (col. 33

lines 4-13),

translating the second information given as character string in the first language into

second information given as a character string in the second language on the basis of said update

data in the knowledge base (col. 33 lines 4-13).

As to claim 10, Clark teaches,

knowledge base means for storing model segments in the form of character strings in

said first language, and in logical connection with these, equivalent segments in the form of

character strings in the second language, and for storing a first, second, and third rule (col. 13

lines 1-9 and col. 8 lines 20-34).

The rest of the limitations of claim 10 are rejected for the similar reasons in rejecting

claim 1.

Claim 11 recites the same or similar limitations as claim 2, rejected above, and therefore

claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons.

As to claim 12, which depends on claim 10, Clark teaches,

user interface means for connecting the user to said knowledge base means (col. 8 lines

53-55 and col. 11 lines 25-36).

As to claim 13, which depends on claim 12, Clark teaches

characterized in that the user interface means are connected to said knowledge base mans over a

transmission network (col. 8 lines 53-55 and col. 11 lines 25-36).

As to claim 14, which depends on claim 10, Clark teaches,

a first knowledge base and a second knowledge base so that specific users have

access to first knowledge base means and only some of specific uses have access to second

knowledge base means (col. 31 lines 40-51; first knowledge base is the translation memory

system, the second knowledge base is the user-interpreter).

As to claim 15, which depends on claim 10, Clark teaches,

a first knowledge base means and a second knowledge base means, selective transfer

of data stored in said knowledge base to first knowledge base (col. 31 lines 40-51;first

knowledge base is the translation memory system, the second knowledge base is the user-

interpreter).

As to claim 16, Clark teaches

a method for machine translation information given as a character string in a first

language into a character string in a second language, comprising the step of:

storage (parser stores target and source segment, col. 17 lines 32-38 Fig. 3 element 320

and Fig. 5 element 510) in a knowledge database (translation memory system, Fig. 3 element

100; col. 7 lines 58-60), a first language character string (source segment, col. 8 lines 60-61)

model segments (source project, Fig. 3 element 300, col. 8 lines 49-52) and storing second

language (target language) model segments (Fig. 3 element 310, legacy files in project identifier,

col. 8 lines 21-35) in logical connection (leverager, Fig. 3 element 340) with these, model

segments (legacy files in project identifier) in the form of character strings in the second

language character string (col. 13 lines 9-19; leverager determines translatable source segment in

source-target pair of a merged source-target data structure of the project matches a translatable

source segment in the corresponding merged source-target data structure generated with respect

to the legacy files),

following a first rule, identifying a first structural segment in a first language character

string (col. 8 lines 23-25 part (a) translatable source segments translated in corresponding target

via legacy files which is a source file that corresponds to a target file, in which the source

segment/character strings are used to identify the structural segment or legacy files);

following a second rule, comparing the first structural segment with the stored first

language character string model segment (col. 8 lines 25-30 part (b); translatable source

segments are morphologically (refers to structure and formation of words) equivalent to

translatable source segments source file of the project or legacy file);

selecting one stored first language character string model segment on the basis of the said

comparison (col. 32 lines 61-67; changes approved by the user-translator are considered

replacements);

reading, as a translation segment, a stored second language model segment that has

previously been logically connected (leverager, Fig. 3 element 340) to the selected one first

language character string model segment (legacy files in project identifier) (col. 13 lines 1-9;

through the leverager, generating target segments for translatable source segments having

translatable source segments in the legacy file);

following a third rule, translating the first structural segment into a said translation

segment, the translation being in the form of a character string in the second language ((col. 13

lines 10-15; matches of translatable source segment in corresponding merged source-target data

structure generated with respect to the legacy files)), wherein,

the first rule comprises the identification of at least one of an intermediate word and a

suffix, (col. 8 lines 45-46 and 59-65);

when following the second rule, no first language character model segment is found that

matches the first segment, (col. 31 lines 30-33; ambiguous translations);

i).   the structural segment is displayed by means of a user interface to a user (col. 31

lines 42-45);

ii).   after the structural segment being displayed to the user, the user inputs, from the

user interface, the translation of the displayed structural segment as the equivalent segment (col.

31 lines 44-49);

iii).   storing the structural segment and the equivalent segment, input by the user, in the

knowledge base for use as model segments in the knowledge base (col. 32 lines 61-67; changes

approved by the user-translator are considered replacements);

one of said rules is updated on the basis of equivalent segment input by the user from the

user interface (col. 32 lines 61-67; edit or replace the selected translation, since translation is

done, the rule for translation has been updated).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark (6,345,243)

in view of Zamora (4,965,763).

As to claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Clark teaches structural segment

(morphological, refers to structure and formatting of words, col. 8 lines 45-46)

Clark does not explicitly teach structural segment comprises of a punctuation mark.

However, Zamora teach structural segment comprises of a punctuation mark (col. 12

lines 42-46).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement the translation memory system of Clarks into the information extraction

that parses punctuation marks of Zamora, because Zamora teaches that this would want to

identify automatically commonly specified information in free format to provide automatic

indexing and indexing aid, Abstract.

Conclusion

6.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure. see attached PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MP   06/10/2006

RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER